THE Nation

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 151 NEW YORK · SATURDAY · JULY 27, 1940 NUMBER 4

The Shape of Things

HOW FAR THE LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES will go toward meeting the proposals for common action outlined by Secretary Hull in his opening address at the Havana conference remains to be seen. Representatives of the Pétain government of France have joined Nazi agents in whispered assurances that Germany has no intention of forcing a change in the status of French, Dutch, or Danish possessions in this hemisphere. There is danger that some of the South American countries, influenced in part by the prospect of substantial Nazi orders at the close of the war, may prefer to believe these assurances. But the mere fact that the Pétain regime has associated itself with the Nazis in this propaganda effort should give pause. For German penetration on this continent can come without the cession of any American territory to the Reich. Puppet governments that are wholly subservient to Germany in these European-held American territories would provide a base for Nazi economic, political, and even military encroachment. This threat must be met realistically and fearlessly. But if the United States is to avoid the charge of imperialism, any action that is taken must represent the joint will of the twenty-one American republics. And this can be achieved only if the United States overcomes the very understandable hesitation of those South American countries whose ties are closest with Europe by offering economic terms that are attractive enough to offset Nazi proposals. The half-billion dollars requested by the President may not be enough for this purpose, but it is a hopeful beginning. So also is the emphasis placed by Mr. Hull and other delegates on the importance of raising the standard of living. Even a modest rise in average Latin American income would help to solve the problem of surpluses.

*

FRANCO'S SPAIN IS DRAWING NEARER THAN ever to the Axis powers. It claims the status of a "non-belligerent" ally of Germany and Italy, but there are reasons to suspect that the frequent air raids on Gibraltar are being facilitated by the use of Spanish bases. If these attacks develop into an attempt to lay siege to "the Rock," Spain will have to cast off its threadbare neutrality, and Franco's propagandists are already preparing public opinion for that day. Meanwhile, Franco is playing the role for which he was cast long ago by his fascist backers—that of Axis agent in Latin America. In many countries south of our border Falangist groups closely linked with the Spanish government party are increasingly active. Of great significance also was last week's breaking off of diplomatic relations with Chile, one of the few Latin American countries with a liberal, democratic administration. This move was undoubtedly made in consultation with Berlin and Rome and was probably designed to encourage Chilean reactionaries in their hostility to the government of President Aguirre Cerda. Recent arrests have shown a close connection between local fascist groups and the Nazi Party, which is strongly intrenched in southern Chile, where there is a very large population of German origin. According to Russell B. Porter, whose dispatches to the New York *Times* have given a revealing picture of German activities in Chile, there are good reasons to fear an attempted coup whenever Berlin gives the signal. It would hardly be surprising if this followed the Spanish model of an ostensibly "spontaneous" revolt against the Popular Front government. Let us hope that our government has thoroughly digested the lessons of Spain and is prepared to move swiftly against any attempt by the Axis powers to repeat their tactics in this hemisphere.

*

A WORKING AGREEMENT ON MONETARY policies has been reached between the treasuries of the United States and Great Britain. For the duration of the war London sterling is to be maintained at its controlled rate of $4.03 with the cooperation of the American authorities. This is a protection to American trade, since sterling in a free market would be likely to depreciate heavily, making it easier for British exporters to compete in Latin America. On the other hand, it would have increased the cost of necessary imports to the British government. Another aspect of the understanding concerns bank balances and securities in this country belong-

Published weekly and copyright, 1940, in the U. S. A. by The Nation, Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, December 18, 1897, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to governments and citizens of countries conquered or dominated by Germany. These funds, estimated at roughly $2,270,000,000, are to remain frozen for the time being. Withdrawals will only be permitted under license from the Treasury, which will not be granted in cases where the dollar proceeds might fall into German hands. This would occur when the owner is a resident of a country occupied by the Nazis, since they have ordered that all transfers from abroad be made through the Reichsbank, which not only charges a fat fee but retains the foreign-exchange proceeds and pays out in local currency. There remains the delicate question of transfers to unoccupied France; this will become acute if and when the Pétain government demands the right to draw on its very large balances in this country. It would then be up to the State Department to decide whether the new French regime should be recognized as fully independent or whether it should be treated as dominated by Germany. Owing to the British blockade France is not able to use its dollars to finance purchases in America. It may therefore be taken for granted that any French funds released would get into German hands and be used for financing propaganda here and in Latin America.

*

BRITAIN'S SURRENDER ON THE BURMA ROAD now appears to have been even more indefensible than was first indicated. Chungking denies that any effort has been made, as was alleged in London, to link the closing of the road with mediation of the Chinese-Japanese conflict. This is just as well in present circumstances, for any such effort would play into Japan's hands by freeing its war machine for the long-anticipated adventure in the South Seas. However, Secretary Hull's plea that the road be kept open for trade between the United States and China, reiterated on a second occasion, made it clear that the agreement was not reached in collaboration with the United States. It is true, as Mr. Churchill stressed before the Commons, that the agreement is a temporary one which will have little immediate effect, since the road is virtually impassable during the rainy season. But there is little reason to suppose that what Mr. Churchill admits to be a play for time will work to the advantage of either China or England. Already the new Japanese government has served notice that it intends to press for even more rigorous restrictions on trade with China when the present agreement expires. The Churchill government's decision to appease Japan may weaken somewhat its good-will in this country. But criticism should, perhaps, be directed in the first place to our own State Department. Mr. Hull's condemnation would have had greater force if it had come before the British made their decision and if he had given them real diplomatic support in resisting Japan's demands.

PRINCE KONOYE HAS ANNOUNCED THE completion of Japan's first outright totalitarian Cabinet. The Cabinet itself, apart from the Premier, Foreign Minister, and representatives of the two services, is composed of men practically unknown in political life. But it rests undisguisedly upon the ultra-patriotic army extremists who have been seeking power for nearly ten years. Although these groups have had strong representation in previous governments, they have been carefully counterbalanced by representatives of the old-line political parties. The party system is now to be superseded by a single, fascist party headed by Prince Konoye. With the elimination of all moderate elements Japan may be expected to pursue a foreign policy that is aggressive to the point of recklessness. This will involve a revival of Japan's former close collaboration with the Axis but not necessarily formal entrance into Europe's war.

*

FOR THE MOMENT, TEMPORARY AGREEMENTS having been reached with France and England, the new government's drive appears to be directed primarily against the United States. Wang Ching-wei's puppet government has issued an order for the expulsion from Shanghai of six prominent Americans known to be actively anti-Japanese and anti-fascist. A brawl between a group of American sailors and Japanese policemen at Tsingtao has been magnified for the purpose of bringing pressure on the United States. To meet this new challenge the State Department is reliably reported to be considering an embargo on scrap iron and some other raw materials to Japan under the May Defense Expediting Act. *The Nation,* in accord with an overwhelming majority of Americans, has long advocated such a step, but it must be recognized that a partial embargo will not suffice to check the new extremist regime. This can only be achieved by a broad embargo which includes petroleum products, particularly aviation gasoline, and copper, lead, and other non-ferrous metals, together with machinery and parts useful in war. If the embargo is made sufficiently comprehensive, Japan, depending as it does on this country for about 75 per cent of its essential imported war supplies, would be rendered physically unable to continue its planned depredations in the Far East.

*

RUSSIA'S MOVES TO RECAPTURE ITS LOST Baltic provinces, which began with a series of ultimatums last fall, are now reaching a successful conclusion. By resolution of their parliaments Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have declared themselves Soviet republics and requested admission to the U. S. S. R. Within the next few days the Kremlin is expected solemnly to accede to their petitions. Squeezed as they are between two totalitarian powers, these small states could hardly hope to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maintain any kind of independence, and union with Russia may be their best bet in a choice of evils. However, it is by no means a free choice, for the recent elections were merely an imitation of a hackneyed Nazi farce. The Red Army was occupying all three countries; the campaign was dominated by Soviet slogans; only one ticket, that of the Working People's Bloc, controlled by Communists, was permitted. The authorities insured a large poll by stamping the identity card of each voter and letting it be known that non-voters would be regarded as undependable. Under these circumstances, majorities of over 90 per cent of the electorates are as unsurprising as they are unreliable. On grounds of self-defense Russia has a case for absorbing the Baltic states. It would be more convincing without resort to hokum which deceives no one.

*

WE HAVE LONG REGARDED A THIRD-TERM nomination for Franklin D. Roosevelt as inevitable. Not without misgiving we have come to the conclusion that the vital need of an experienced man, an established prestige, and a proved anti-fascist spirit outweighs the undesirability of violating a good and reasonable tradition. We do not question the sincerity of men like Dr. Hamilton Holt, president of Rollins College, who have repudiated the choice of the Chicago convention solely on the third-term issue. But we do question their sense of values, their conception of the alternatives. We agree with Dr. Holt that there must be more than 5,000 men in the United States fit to be President, but our correspondent's analysis elsewhere in this issue shows how little chance any of them had to be nominated. If Roosevelt had been eliminated, the choice would much more probably have fallen on a Farley or a McNutt—with consequences to a beleaguered democracy which Dr. Holt could not contemplate with pleasure. And we believe further that in the hue and cry against the third term the voices of the Hamilton Holts will be drowned out by those of men who find in this issue a long-sought weapon to kill the New Deal in the name of democracy.

*

THE ROLL CALL OF DEMOCRATS WHO HAVE bolted the party because of the Roosevelt nomination is, so far, not a roster that need fill Mr. Farley's successor with concern. Most vocal of the "walkers" is Senator Edward R. Burke, who maintains that the third-term nomination is "fraught with peril to our free institutions." This is the same Senator Burke who two years ago made a first-hand study of European labor problems and, in the words of the New York *Herald Tribune*, "praised without stint the accomplishments of the Nazi regime in Germany." Similarly disaffected is Senator Rush D. Holt, like Burke a lame duck with an almost uninterrupted record of opposition to the Administration, and two former members of Roosevelt's "little cabinet," both long since soured on the New Deal. In addition to the loss of this quartet the Roosevelt campaign will have to get along without the services of what is called the "Democratic Executive Committee." Headed by former Senator James A. Reed, this organism is a kind of "Against Roosevelt Before 1940 Club" which failed to put a crimp in the Roosevelt campaign four years ago and has been hiding ever since. Lesser lights have also left the party to crusade with Willkie, and there are probably more to come. They are assured of having their name writ large in the columns of a national press which has plainly decided that even a hint of such defection is front-page news.

*

A HUMANITARIAN PROJECT TO EVACUATE thousands of children from Britain to the United States and Canada has become a political and military issue in the House of Commons. A mass removal of such magnitude—200,000 British families have registered their children with the official agency for that purpose—would involve the use of ships and convoys which can be ill spared with the Nazis about to attack, and even then the danger of a tragedy at sea would remain; if the plan

CONTENTS

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 61
EDITORIALS:
LABOR MUST UNITE 64
ROBERT DELL 65
PEACE MANEUVERS by Freda Kirchwey 65
IT HAD TO BE ROOSEVELT by Robert Bendiner 66
WAR AS REVOLUTION.
1. THE BREAKING OF NATIONS by Max Lerner 68
MEXICO'S NEW CHANCE by Harry Block 71
WITHIN THE GATES 73
IN THE WIND 74
BOOKS AND THE ARTS:
NOTES BY THE WAY by Margaret Marshall 75
MISS STEIN AND FRANCE by Justin O'Brien 76
WENDELL WILLKIE'S ECONOMICS? by Lewis Corey 76
PORTRAIT IN PAPER by John Peale Bishop 78
THE NEW ORDER IN ASIA by Maxwell S. Stewart 78
RECORDS by B. H. Haggin 79

Editor and Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor ROBERT BENDINER
Literary Editor MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON MAXWELL S. STEWART I. F. STONE

Dramatic Critic
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

*

Business Manager and Director of Circulation
HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager
MURIEL C. GRAY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were not operated in such a way as to give equal consideration to rich and poor alike, it would be a source of powerful and justified criticism—the exodus of rich and titled children has already set off fireworks in the Commons. It has been suggested here that the United States send ships, under the provisions which apply to Red Cross vessels, to bring the children across the Atlantic, but that is easier said than done. The Departments of State and Justice have acted to facilitate the granting of visas to children, but it would be necessary for Congress to legalize the plan for sending ships. We hope Congress will make it possible to dispatch American rescue ships to Europe, but we cannot help feeling that the first one should be used to take out of the unoccupied parts of France those anti-fascists of all nations who are on the Nazi death list, to be liquidated when and if caught.

Labor Must Unite

THE party conventions and more spectacular phases of the defense program have combined to divert attention from the Labor Policy Advisory Committee, called together three weeks ago by Sidney Hillman in his capacity as head of the Division of Labor Supply of the National Defense Advisory Board. Yet the formation of this committee, with the cooperation of all branches of the trade-union movement, is the most promising step toward labor unity since the fatal split between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. developed.

After its first meeting the board issued a statement saying that its members had assured Mr. Hillman of their readiness "to meet the responsibilities placed upon them by defense requirements and to join in the common effort to prepare the nation for any emergency which may arise." By itself such a pious statement means little, but it is clear that both Hillman and his coadjutors intend to give labor a full voice in the planning of defense. Not the least important of their tasks is to resist pressures designed to force the worker to contribute to defense through the lowering of standards.

On the other hand, the functions of the board are not to be regarded as purely negative. It has a large part to play in assuring that production shall not be delayed by lack of skilled labor. This has been the outstanding subject on the agenda of its first meetings, and it is working on plans, not only for the training of youth, but also for the salvaging and retraining of older men from the ranks of the jobless. As Mr. Hillman's first report to the President put it: "The unemployed, in the opinion of this division, constitute the greatest labor resource which can be used expeditiously in this connection."

The board has also been consulted on the problem of averting strikes. This is a crucial issue for labor. It is bound to be the policy of a government concentrated on defense to press for solution of labor disputes without suspension of work. Mr. Hillman's division, cooperating with the conciliation service of the Department of Labor, has already intervened in three cases of threatened strike action. Its ability to exert a strong influence in the direction of protecting labor's rights will be much enhanced if the trade unions stand firmly together.

From this point of view the functions of the Labor Advisory Board are perhaps less important than its composition. It has sixteen members; six each from the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. and four from the independent brotherhoods. The A. F. of L. representatives are outstanding officials of important unions, but they do not include any of the old-guard bureaucrats who have been to the fore in the bitter battle with the C. I. O. Similarly the C. I. O. members are moderates, most of whom are unsympathetic to the recent political gyrations of John L. Lewis. As a whole the board represents the most responsible and stable elements in both factions; and they are men who can feel, understand, and reflect the strong and growing urge of the rank and file toward unity.

When the names of the board were first announced, many fears were expressed that it would be blasted before it had had a chance to settle down by attacks from the diehards who had been left out. We are keeping our fingers crossed, but so far nothing untoward has occurred. As regards the reigning clique of the A. F. of L., their acquiescence may be inspired by a growing sense of insecurity. They have been weakened by revelations of their unwillingness or inability to check racketeering in a few unions; worse still are intrigues uncovered by recent investigations which show that union policies have on occasion been secretly formulated by big employers and industrial associations. There are no such sins to be laid at M. Lewis's door, but he has lost some of his hold on the rank and file of the C. I. O. by his intemperate attacks on the New Deal.

There can be no doubt that American trade unionists are heartily sick of the quarrels that have split the movement. In the difficult days ahead unity is needed as never before, and there will be no energy to spare for internecine strife if labor's gains of the past few years are to be held. The battle between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. has always been at its hottest among the top leaders, who have often trampled on their reluctant followers the better to exchange blows. In the ranks on both sides there appears to be little genuine animosity. In particular situations and in particular places members of A. F. of L. and C. I. O. unions have often worked together in harmony and with success. The institution of the Labor Advisory Board is an attempt to seek similar cooperation at the top so that labor may play its rightful part in the solution of a great problem.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Robert Dell

ROBERT DELL'S death has brought loss to *The Nation* and sorrow to its editors. His friendship has been a constant satisfaction and stimulus, and his contributions, dating from soon after the World War, have brought to the pages of this journal a wealth of experience and knowledge unmatched by any other regular contributor. For Robert Dell was the dean of the Continental correspondents both by reason of his years of service and, even more, because of his understanding of the dark intricacies of international politics. His articles for the Manchester *Guardian* constitute a running history of the past generation.

Robert Dell was wise with a wisdom that never grew soft or stale. His recent contributions to *The Nation,* especially those preceding the start of the war, were as crisp and unillusioned as those of twenty years back. His mind was a most precise instrument; as a consequence his writing was never blurred by evasion or by the hopes of his generous heart. He believed what the facts forced him to believe and wrote with little regard for the effect of his words. He was a political journalist, not a politician. And the effect of his words was often explosive. The story of his expulsion from France in 1918 has been told many times, but it is worth recalling for the light it throws on his character as a journalist. He had learned from sources in the Chamber of Deputies of the secret peace negotiations with Austria carried on the previous year by Prince Sixte de Bourbon. He told the facts in the Manchester *Guardian,* and his dispatch created a sensation in the press of every country. As a result of this major scoop Dell was expelled from France by Clemenceau. The decree of expulsion was lifted in 1924, and Dell returned to the country he both loved and criticized.

It is a matter for sorrow that Robert Dell died without completing his autobiography, begun this winter in New York. His life was inextricably entangled with the happenings of his time. For many of his early years in England he served on the executive committee of the Fabian Society. He had been an art critic and dealer and was the founder and joint editor of England's best art journal, the *Burlington Magazine.* He knew the leading personalities of Europe and many in America. From his vantage-point at Geneva he watched through recent years the fatal procession of events, forecasting with unhappy accuracy the consequences of each misstep of Europe's leaders. He hated fascism with a bitterness that only a "good European" of the old school could feel; it was the enemy not only of political freedom but of all the habits and relationships that made life rich. Dell's Europe is *in extremis,* and one can perhaps be thankful that he died before its death became a certainty.

Peace Maneuvers

BY FREDA KIRCHWEY

IT WOULD be foolish to look upon Hitler's "peace appeal" as a sign of weakness. Germany is not weak. The British know it and are not deluding themselves with false hopes. None the less the speech was something more than an opportunity for Nazi self-congratulations. War may be a virile nation's highest form of self-expression, but it costs a lot in men and steel and oil and food. What Hitler wants is what he has always wanted—victory without war. He has always been hurt when this reasonable demand has been rejected. His success in war makes the refusal of his enemies to yield in advance all the more irrational. Since they must accept defeat in the end, why not in the beginning?

Lord Halifax's reply was clear-cut and uncompromising. He correctly characterized Hitler's proposal as a demand for surrender, and rejected it. If his confidence in the support of the Almighty sounded somewhat excessive, it is comforting to realize that it is backed by growing battalions and an increased sense of power. The ordinary people of the country have apparently been stiffened rather than shaken by the threats and bombast that fill the Nazi press and flood the air waves. They know now what peace with Hitler means, not through the words of their leaders but through the fate of their neighbors. Before their eyes lie the ruins of states—not countries "far away of which the people know nothing," but countries just across the Channel which have existed as independent states because Britain desired and defended their independence, and which served in turn as a bulwark of British independence. Their collapse and subjection have not taught the British people the lesson Hitler may have expected. On the contrary they know now that their only hope of living as free men lies in their power of resistance. This is the lesson they have learned from Holland and Belgium and France—a lesson they failed to heed when Spain and Czechoslovakia went down to defeat. I believe Halifax was only speaking the mind of the people of his country when he said: "We realize that the struggle may cost us everything, but just because the things we are defending are worth any sacrifice it is a noble privilege to be the defenders of things so precious."

Many people couple glib talk of Hitler's "invincibility" with reports of the defeatism and military inadequacies of his victims. No one knows the relative importance of these factors. But it is wise to remember that in the degree to which Germany's enemies were betrayed from within, Hitler was aided to victory. Only a fool would minimize Nazi strength; but it is no less reckless to assume that Hitler cannot be resisted. If Britain has profited by the French defeat and wiped out

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its internal enemies, the Nazi machine may betray unsuspected weaknesses. Perhaps Hitler fears this; perhaps the conquest of Britain looks less quick and certain than those that went before; perhaps he realizes that even if he wins he must pay a high price for victory. Perhaps that is why he asked Britain to ask for peace.

Ambassador Bullitt is known to have sympathized with the fascist rebellion in Spain; his influence in Washington undoubtedly contributed to the Administration's cruel and fatal policy of withholding aid from the legitimate government of Spain under the technical pretense of neutrality. Now Bullitt has come back to Washington to report on the political situation in France. Pétain, he says, is doing a good job. Laval, frankly an advocate of close relations with the fascist states, is not running the new government; Pétain is the "boss" and enjoys the universal respect and confidence of the people. He said he saw no reason why he should not resume his post as ambassador. He pointed out that no question had arisen of recognizing the Pétain government because "we had never broken off relations."

All this has disturbing implications. We have consistently refused to recognize the puppet governments of conquered nations. We have continued to deal with the representatives of free Czechoslovakia and Poland and Norway. France is, of course, in a somewhat different category. The unoccupied region pretends to an independent regime. But the realities deny it no matter what Ambassador Bullitt thinks or reports to the President. If we continue to recognize and do business with the Pétain government, we shall have scant excuse for continuing to freeze French assets and still less to withhold goods. France is no longer a belligerent; in the eyes of Mr. Bullitt it is presumably a harmless neutral. Before Mussolini declared war, Italy served as a syphon to draw goods into Germany. France can now perform the same function more successfully, since it is far less independent and able to consult its own interests than the minor member of the Axis partnership. The Administration took steps to freeze French assets in the United States the moment the government surrendered; in Havana it is perfecting plans to keep French possessions out of German hands. It is to be hoped that the President, who understands better than any other public man the full unvarnished implications of Nazi control, will repudiate the position taken by Mr. Bullitt. To treat conquered France as a sovereign neutral power would be of incalculable aid to Hitler. The President's own eloquent statement of policy in his speech to the Chicago convention should provide an answer to the arguments of his persuasive ambassador.

It Had to Be Roosevelt

BY ROBERT BENDINER

Chicago, July 19

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT'S third nomination was dictated—even as the Peglers, the Hugh Johnsons, and the greater part of the American press said it was—but it was not dictated by Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was forced upon this convention by the sheer weight of circumstances. No Harry Hopkins sitting in the Blackstone Hotel was needed to bring about the Roosevelt nomination, and no Farley could have prevented it. The local machines of the Kellys, the Hagues, the Crumps, and the Sullivans were not slavishly carrying out New Deal orders; they were doing the only thing they could do to win an election. A nervous respect for the fabulous Willkie's chances was plainly in the air, and the dullest mind at Chicago understood clearly that to beat him the party could not afford to lead with a Farley, a Garner, or even a glamorous McNutt. There were other and more respectable factors in the Roosevelt victory, but this was the prime consideration, and it was enough to underscore the silliness of those who insisted that Roosevelt was not drafted but "drafted."

On a higher plane was the consideration that the successes of Adolf Hitler called for a continuation of the Roosevelt regime. I heard a great deal of this kind of talk. Much of it, moreover, came from Southern delegates, who had the least stake in a Roosevelt nomination since, with a national ticket headed by Beelzebub or even Josef Stalin himself, they could be sure of their local successes in November. "Roosevelt knows what that Hitler's up to," one of them said to me. "He's called the shots so far, and we don't want someone in there at a time like this who doesn't know the ropes." An Alabaman went so far as to say that if the Republicans had been in power these past eight years he'd vote Republican just to keep an even keel in a rough sea—which for a Dixie delegate is tall talk indeed.

Genuine as the draft was, I would not say that the convention was a happy affair. Politicians are not a philosophical lot, and the compulsion to choose Roosevelt did not make his selection more palatable. Dissatisfaction took two courses: an attempt to hedge the nominee about with a restricting platform and a conservative running-mate, and a smothered rebelliousness that came to the surface in the bitter fight against Wallace at the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Franklin D. Roosevelt

close of the convention. The rout of the anti-New Deal forces, both in the platform and in the choice of a vice-presidential candidate, must be put down as the most significant development of the week.

Why did Roosevelt insist on Wallace? Here was a chance to placate the disgruntled tories of the party at the lowest possible price; an opportunity to head off talk of dictation by allowing the convention the greatest possible leeway in a normally harmless pastime. Actually Speaker of the House Bankhead, around whom the rebels rallied, is not a reactionary of the Garner stamp. He has had a good voting record on New Deal legislation and time after time has gone down the line for the President. Yet Roosevelt gave out the word that he wanted Wallace and stuck to him through hell and some pretty high water. The fact that Wallace was a dictated candidate was made painfully—even suspiciously—obvious by some of the Administration lieutenants. In repudiating his own candidacy and throwing his weight to Wallace did McNutt have to say: "My commander-in-chief speaks and I follow"? Did Senator Lucas of Illinois, in a similar demonstration of loyalty, have to add, "Had this been a free and open convention I would not have hesitated to make the race"?

Roosevelt's insistence on Wallace was, at least in part, a refutation of the argument that the draft was a fraud. No man trying to force himself on an unwilling convention could have taken the tack that Roosevelt did. He was so clearly in demand that he was able to dictate terms, and the choice of Wallace was a sign that victory next November was to mean not just a triumph for the Democratic Party; it was to mean an extension of the New Deal. In effect he said to the bosses of the city machines: "You need me in order to stay in power yourselves. My price is a free hand. I want no Garners this time." But Wallace's choice has more than this symbolic importance. The Secretary of Agriculture has been quietly building up his prestige in Latin America, learning Spanish on the side and devoting himself to the problems of economic cooperation in the Western Hemisphere. He may well leave points of order in the Senate chamber to a lesser mind and become the Administration's Number One man in the coming struggle south of the Rio Grande. It was fitting that the Puerto Rican who cast his delegation's vote concluded his short speech with a hearty "Viva Meestair Wallace!" Finally it is not far-fetched to conclude that in picking Wallace Roosevelt was designating his heir. A period in the vice-presidency would give Wallace the spotlight he needs by way of preparation. For a potential candidate for the Presidency, Wallace was roughly received in Chicago, but that is hardly a serious matter. In part he was opposed for the sin of having once been a Republican, in part because a convention whose Presidential choice had been so confined by historical need and political expediency was ready to kick over the traces. It is also worth noting that the greatest part of the booing that greeted every mention of Wallace's name came from the galleries, where hundreds of Legion men and Two-Per-Centers had found seats on special passes marked "good Thursday night only" and carefully inspected by picked ushers wearing McNutt buttons. The gallery's vigorous attentions to Wallace stemmed less from any special hostility to him than from a fierce if calculated loyalty to McNutt, whose last-minute withdrawal they refused to swallow.

In the framing of the platform the President was clearly more of a mind to give ground. In the first place, platforms have a life expectancy of about one week, and, secondly, opposition to the Roosevelt foreign policy, the only important source of controversy, came from men like Senators Wheeler, McCarran, and the two Clarks, who had little or no stake in a Roosevelt victory and could afford to go to embarrassing lengths in their attack. The internal squabbles of the Resolutions Committee were kept strictly private, but a leader of the group hinted confidentially and darkly that the President's original proposals, contained in what was to be a preamble to the platform, were so drastic as to have made our involvement in the war inevitable. They also were said to have included a plea for the kind of regimented society needed to cope with a totalitarian power. I do not question the honesty of my informant, but I believe his interpretations, particularly in this field, are likely to be on the hysterical side and are open to serious question. However, it seems clear that, as a good horse-trader, the President asked for more than he hoped to get. Nor did he come off badly in the inevitable compromise. At first blush the foreign plank drafted at Chicago is less interventionist in character than its Philadelphia counterpart. The Republican statement on the war says merely that the party "is firmly opposed to involving this nation in foreign war." The Democrats state specifically, "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our army, navy, or air force to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack." The rub comes in the exception, which was jammed through at the last moment by direct wire from the White House to Jimmie Byrnes, the President's faithful lieutenant.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The isolationists say they are satisfied with the final form of the plank, but I know for a fact that they are anything but satisfied. Senator Wheeler admitted that he was not present when the crucial phrase was inserted. When it was suggested that a Nazi coup in Uruguay, for example, might be regarded as an "attack," he replied, with scant conviction, that such a development was not an instance of attack but of infiltration. He was obviously unhappy about the whole course of events at Chicago, and I am convinced that such campaign support as Roosevelt will get from the isolationist wing of his party would be better dispensed with.

The convention left a sour taste in many mouths, but mostly they were the mouths of anti-New Dealers or of those Quixotes who would rather see democracy die in theoretical purity than make the least compromise for the sake of its preservation. Jimmie Byrnes, buzzing up the aisles with the message "No Wallace, no Roosevelt," seemed scarcely the torch-bearer of democracy, nor was it a pretty sight to see the Kelly-Nash machine and other similarly unsavory units deliver the necessary vote to a man of Wallace's caliber. But choices in politics are rarely pleasant. If such compromises with the facts of life are necessary in order to make any headway short of violent change—and it is clear that they are—then it is better to make them in a party convention than in the conduct of the government. Roosevelt forced Wallace at Chicago and by his victory freed himself from the kind of miserable program of concession and horse-trading that he might otherwise have faced for another term. Had he run on a ticket with Jesse Jones or McNutt he would have compromised himself and his cause far more seriously and exposed his program to the deadly effects of four more years of sabotage from within.

In his choice of alternatives at Chicago, in his speech with its sweeping perception of the meaning of events abroad, and in his selection of Henry Wallace, Roosevelt seemed to tower above his party and above the Republican opposition. It may be that two week-long sessions of unbelievably hammy oratory have left me an easy mark for the first sign of political intelligence combined with good-will, but if Roosevelt is not indispensable at this moment in American history, I have at least not seen his equal either at Chicago or at Philadelphia.

The War as Revolution

I. THE BREAKING OF NATIONS

BY MAX LERNER

IT WILL be hard for America to prepare its armed forces to face the contingencies of the war, but it will be even harder for us to prepare our thinking for the new world we shall have to live in. Harder because, while the might of the German military machine has now become the prime tangible in the world, the framework within which it has come to operate with such success is a framework of intangibles, elusive to our urgency and unpleasant to our prejudices. Harder, too, because we think, as we live, by the last moments of the clock, and our outlook today has a panic quality that is the enemy of thought.

The thrust of the Nazi columns has left its trauma not only on the European consciousness but on the American as well. Look at the way in which two new phrases have established themselves in our speech—*Blitzkrieg* and fifth column. We are like someone who wakes out of an anaesthetic sleep in a strange room, inclosed by unfamiliar walls, and wonders whether the spectral shapes around him are nightmare imaginings or terrible realities. Clinging to the radio, hoping against hope as we listen to the sickening bulletins, we attempt to exorcise the horror. But it will not away. These are not ghosts—this brutal power of the Nazi war machine, this pervasiveness of a new system of ideas, this dynamic will of the German governing group, these new barbarians come to sweep away the empires of our minds. We shall not for a long time restore ourselves to the tranquillity we once owned.

One of the results of the almost fantastic disintegration of country after country before Hitler's drive to power has been the bewilderment and disillusionment of the American people. Nor is it hard to see the basis of our mood. Those whom we have always thought of as the border guards of our civilization have been routed like so many wooden soldiers. The old landmarks are gone: the radicals have become conservative, the reactionaries of the world have become its revolutionists. Yet here lies our greatest danger. If we yield to bewilderment and hysteria we have three-quarters lost the battle. Now as never before we must know what we believe in, what America stands for, what the imperatives are which will determine our actions. The world in which we live is facing an era of wars, civil wars, and revolutions. Only a new tough-mindedness in the service of a set of fervent convictions can possibly rescue

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

us from what seems the common doom. Only thus shall we master the dimensions of the battlefield which has become our world, and act in it with the economy that makes survival possible, so that we may live in it with the grace that gives life meaning.

And first we must understand that the war, which seemed during its first eight months a good deal less than a war (remember the quips about the *Sitzkrieg?*), is in reality, and has been from the beginning, a good deal more than a war. It is the military phase of a complex of changes and tensions in Western life so vast as to amount to a revolution. One difficulty in estimating American opinion on the war lies in the fact that the Great Debate has been couched wholly in terms of intervention or non-intervention. "Are you warmongers?" the non-interventionists hurl at the interventionists when they plead for armaments for Great Britain. "Would you rather send your guns or your sons?" the interventionists hurl back. In such a debate everything depends of course on the reality and immediacy of the Hitler threat to America, and on whether Hitler can be ultimately appeased and will stay appeased. What each side tends to forget, however, is that neither intervention nor non-intervention in itself ends the problem; and that the effect of helping Britain or not helping Britain, of going to war or not going to war, depends upon the nature of the forces active in the world today, the forces which have conditioned Hitler's rise and shaped his victory thus far. The Great Debate has been carried on wholly in terms of immediate program. But at the risk of being called academic, I want to say that analysis is even more important than program. If your basic analysis is right, you can shift your immediate program with the shift of events. But if you shape a program blindly, without reference to the major currents in the world, you drift helplessly with every change.

We must recognize that what is happening today is something very close to a world revolution. It is not the sort of revolution that Marxists have for a century envisaged. Theirs was a revolution from below, led by a disciplined and class-conscious group. But that revolution missed fire. It had its chance on a world scale, and it may have its chance again in another generation. Right now, however, the revolutionary wedge has been driven in by a new élite working from above—a praetorian guard in every country operating in what Lenin would have called "a revolutionary situation"—using the leftist methods of propaganda, violence, and class war, taking advantage of the contradictions of capitalist economics but for ends far removed from the ends of the left.

We speak of Hitler's triumph, and we should err monstrously to underestimate the greatness of Hitler's role. Hitler will take his place in the succession of praetorian leaders who shaped world history, from Alexander and Attila and Genghis Khan through Napoleon. He may well rank as the outstanding instance of a man who, knowing no ruth, willed not only his ends but his means as well, and who took not one country or even one continent but the whole world as his stamping-ground. Rauschning has written convincingly of Hitler's megalomaniac outlook. He represents the triumph of an insidious intelligence, an unbridled imagination, a steel will, in a world that did not know its purposes and did not organize its forces. Yet knowing all this we must not too easily succumb either to the great-man theory or the devil theory of history. Hitler has been able to do what he has done because he has been active in a situation ripe for him.

We have been told time and again that Nazism is a revolution. Rauschning has said it, Dorothy Thompson has said it, Peter Drucker has said it, Thomas Mann has said it, Archibald MacLeish has said it. Rauschning calls it "the revolution of nihilism" and MacLeish "the revolution against." They are of course right. Nazism is revolutionary. But it is not the revolution I have in mind when I speak of the war as the expression of a world revolution. Nazism is a bastard revolution. It is a revolution enforced from above by the will of a man and a group of adventurers around him, enforced by terror and accepted through fear. But—and this is the important thing—it is a revolution that has been accepted for want of a better one. It is a premature and destructive organization of revolutionary forces that might have had, and may still have, an alternative organization.

What are those forces? The first is the result of our incapacity to organize world peace after the last war. We made a political settlement, but it was frustrate because it did not provide an economic settlement as well. We left a Europe of fragmented nations, incapable of joining together economically because of their national rivalries, yet incapable of surviving without thus joining together. The Europe of the past quarter-century has been a Europe of international disorganization, capitalist collapse, liberal helplessness, tory sabotage. Thus the way was left open for someone to organize Europe by sheer unqualified force. Whether he will succeed in keeping Europe organized after his conquests is another matter, which I want to come back to later. For the present it is enough to point out that European disorganization has been an element in the revolutionary complex.

Closely related to this has been the failure of the nation-state as a viable economic unit. We live in a time which may be described generally as a time of the breaking of nations. But there is a specific sense as well in which this term applies. Even if Hitler can be stopped, the day of the nation-state is over. Hitler has often been compared to Napoleon, and the present period to that of Europe under the French imperium. The analogy is not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without force. Nevertheless, though particular nations fell under the hoofs of Napoleon's cavalry, the nation-state as such was not one of the victims. In fact, the Napoleonic period represented one of the high points of national development—the completion of the feudal break-up which opened the path for the fully developed nation-state. Nor do I believe that the historical analogy between the present period and that of the barbarian invasions is from this angle a wholly apt one. The barbarian tribes broke up the top-heavy structure of the Roman Empire but for centuries could not replace it with anything—not until the emergence of the nation-state. For me the most interesting comparison is that between the present period and the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which saw the break-up in Europe of the small feudal unit and the rise of the nation-state. The small nations that remain after the present war, whoever wins it, will become economic satellites of large and powerful empires or will have to combine with other small nations, not into a diplomatic bloc, but into a working economic and administrative community. It is significant that even before the start of the Hitler *Blitzkrieg* there was talk of a real Anglo-French Union, and that the proposal was being seriously considered when Reynaud was forced out by the Pétain clique.

And what was true of these two great nations is even truer of the small ones. Our generation and the next will witness the transition from the present nation-state to a new form of economic empire-state. We are entering on an epoch of imperialism in which the surviving economies will not be national but continental or even hemispheric economies. Germany and its satellite states are likely to constitute one such economy, Russia and its satellites another, Japan will probably be the center of a Far Eastern economic constellation, and the Americas may, if they have the luck and courage, constitute a Western one. That at any rate is the possible picture unless Hitler is able to push on and absorb Russia, sweep the Japanese Empire within the Nazi orbit, and drive a wedge between the United States and Latin America, thus smashing the Monroe Doctrine. In such an event we should have something much closer to Dorothy Thompson's picture, in her recent remarkable *Herald Tribune* article, of a Hitler world economy. But what I have sought to indicate is that even if Hitler is unsuccessful in plunging the sword of his hopes up to its hilt into the world, the day of the nation-state is over. The reader will note that I have omitted the British Commonwealth from my list of emerging imperial economies. Whether it deserves a place there or not is being decided now in the skies over England.

What has brought about this lack of viability in the nation-state? The economists say it is the rise of economic nationalism, and there can be no doubt that there is an element of truth as well as of irony in the fact that the extension of nationalism from the political and cultural into the economic realm has meant the death-knell of nations. Yet it is truer to say that it is not the reaching for national economic self-sufficiency but the failure to achieve it which has resulted in international chaos. It has become impossible in the world today to cling to an anarchic and unplanned economy and still survive. And this leads me to the third revolutionary element—the thrust within each national economic unit toward centralized economic power, state intervention in all the major decisions of the industrial structure, in short, toward planning as an economic imperative. Germany's war preparation began crucially with Hitler's first steps in reorganizing the German economy on a basis of planning. The really dangerous German propaganda is Hitler's propaganda by deed, his demonstration that planning can raise the national income and maximize economic effectiveness, even though by inhuman methods and for inhuman ends. And not the least potent factor in the German military campaign has been such a coordination of German war units as could be achieved only by a planned military machine that was part of a planned economy, and only by the discipline of a group habituated to the technique of planning. The English under Baldwin and Chamberlain were under the illusion that they could win the war and carry on "business as usual" under the anarchic conditions of an unplanned capitalism. They are now hastening to correct their error; yet it must be remembered that planning is not only a matter of intention but of practice and habituation as well. Unless the English war machine can work smoothly as part of an English economy brought to its maximum productive capacity through planning, aided by American economic reserves, there is no hope for England.

The fourth revolutionary force is the great development in war technology and war administration. Both Germans and Russians have had the daring to liberate themselves from the conception of war as combat, and have adopted the logical implications of war as a machine process. What a delight Veblen would have taken in pointing out the way in which the machine process has now rounded out its dominance over modern life. But there are other revolutionary elements in warfare which the machine has made possible: the old technique of surprise given a new meaning—*Blitzkrieg;* the old technique of complete concentration of fighting power given a meaning that extends it to all the national resources—total war; and the old technique of propaganda given a new insidiousness in the form of the fifth column. I have pointed out above the extent to which it would be dangerous to separate war techniques from the economic planning of which they are an organic part. It is notable that in both realms Germany and Russia have been explorers, but that in both also Hitler has carried farther what Russia began. And it is also worth

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

noting that the revolution in warfare applies not only to the conquest of power but to its consolidation as well. The whole problem of keeping conquered peoples in subjection is changed when rebel forces find that they must confront the airplane and tank concentration that was hurled at Belgium and France.

Fifth and finally, there has been a psychic revolution in the outlook of men and women throughout the world. This has proceeded from two sources: the failure of unplanned capitalism to make use of productive capacity or to distribute its proceeds so as to provide employment and decent living standards; and the bearing of our new insight into the irrational in people upon the problem of democratic effectiveness. To the unemployed, to WPA workers, to those living on or just below the margin of elementary decency, political democracy and civil liberties may well be made to seem empty forms. And those who understand the irrational depths in men will recognize that the tensions and dissatisfactions produced by collapsing economies may well be exploited for the benefit of political adventurers and the creation of new empires. But a discussion of this psychic revolution leads into areas beyond the bounds of this first article. I hope to explore those areas in the article that follows.

[*The second article of Mr. Lerner's series of three will be printed in an early issue.*]

Mexico's New Chance

BY HARRY BLOCK

Mexico City, July 18

ELECTION DAY has passed, and a lot of the rash predictions made about it were proved false. The long-heralded revolution failed to materialize. The phantom fifth column neither descended from parachutes nor crawled up out of the sewers. Lombardo Toledano's "storm troops" staged no coup d'état. They must, in fact, have had urgent business elsewhere, for they were not in evidence during the election, and the promiscuous violence that marked the day was directed chiefly against *their* buildings. The only surprise in the entire proceedings was the demonstration Almazán was able to make in the Federal District.

As recently as two months ago I wrote that Almazán could not hope to buck the P. R. M. (Party of the Mexican Revolution) and that his bid for power, if it were made at all, would necessarily have to take the form of armed action. The truth of that statement has been fully confirmed by the election results. What I had underestimated was the number of followers whom Almazán would be able to bring out into the streets. He owed thanks for this, however, as I shall show presently, less to the energy and organization of his aides than to the man whom he spent the better part of his campaign reviling, President Cárdenas.

A Mexican election is ordinarily a pretty dull affair. The government party takes possession of the polls; supporters of the opposition candidate—if there is one—are not permitted to vote; and the few who insist on their civic rights are given plenty of time to consider the consequences of their temerity while nursing a broken head. On some occasions the official vote-counters have actually had to invent opposition votes so as to make the returns look less suspiciously unanimous. The process is hardly peculiar to Mexico, but the Mexicans have their own word for it. They call it "imposition."

Curiously enough, all these reprehensible doings take place under one of the most democratic election laws in the world. It would take too long to explain in detail how the law operates to encourage the very abuses it was theoretically framed to prevent, but a large part of the difficulty lies in the fact that it has not the remotest correspondence with the social and political realities of Mexico. Adopted in 1917 and modeled on a Swiss law, it presupposes a rare degree of democratic experience and discipline. By one of its quaint provisions the polls are controlled by the first five citizens to appear on election morning; these five form the local election board, with one of their number as president. This rule was apparently made to convince skeptics that the government would not interfere with the election. In practice, of course, it invites a free-for-all fight, since control of the polls is vital not only in order to get the votes of one's own side cast but also because the presidents of the local boards constitute the official counting boards set up in each district on the following Thursday.

Cárdenas announced a year ago that he would conduct a free election for the choice of his successor: the government party would not monopolize the polls, and everybody could come and vote for whom he pleased. It was assumed that adequate guards would preserve order, but in a desire, apparently, to give the opposition no ground for claiming that it had been prevented from voting by armed force, Cárdenas omitted this precaution. Thus although the city on July 7 was full of troops and police, they might almost as well have stayed in their barracks for all the protection they afforded the voters from the roving bands of *pistoleros*. Shooting began at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

6:30 in the morning, when a carload of Almazanistas shot down four Camachistas in front of a polling place in the hotly disputed Seventh District.

The failure of the capital's labor movement to make a stronger showing at the polls has called forth various explanations, any or all of which may be part of the truth. One is that Camacho issued instructions to his partisans to go unarmed. Lombardo Toledano has since stated that the members of the C. T. M. (Confederation of Mexican Workers) had strict orders not to be provoked into counter-aggressions. Finally, it is said, the workers went out to vote, not to demonstrate or mass at the polls. It is, of course, perfectly true that the appearance of the C. T. M.'s "militia"—which, incidentally, in spite of reports to the contrary, is not and never has been armed—would have led to more bloodshed, and while it might have cleared the streets of the rioting Almazán throngs, it would have done so only at the price of giving color to the charge of "imposition."

After the Seventh District shooting the Almazanistas quickly took possession of a large number of polling places. In nearly every case there was fighting, and some of the booths changed hands two and three times. In only a few places did the police intervene actively, being stationed in general a hundred yards or more away, with blanket orders, as one police official told me while we watched a gun battle in the heart of the city, not to shoot. The regular army troops returned to barracks that night without having fired a bullet. In many parts of the city Almazán's followers started the day the undisputed masters of the streets.

Later in the morning the reprisals began; by noon the hospitals were filling up with dead and wounded. As the fighting grew hotter, assaults were made on the headquarters of the C. T. M., on the labor daily *El Popular,* on several union offices, on the P. R. M. building, and on Camacho's headquarters. The movement was beginning to take on the aspect of a putsch. In the afternoon, with the voting practically over, a march on the National Palace was called for. It mobilized outside the Almazán headquarters in a downtown street and quickly developed into a new riot and an attack on the neighboring P. R. M. radio station. Many more persons were killed or injured, and the police dispersed part of the mob with tear gas. The government hastily threw a cordon of troops around all the approaches to the palace. Cárdenas is reported to have sent Almazán word to bring his partisans back to their senses. It is an open question whether it was this or the rain which now began that finally broke up the march. By nightfall the fighting had died out, and all Mexico that had the price and was still able to walk was going to the movies quite as though nothing had happened.

It is possible that the Almazán riots were not premeditated. The lack of adequate policing of the polls was a break for the opposition of which it took instant advantage; from then on the movement gained momentum. Obviously a demonstration for foreign consumption had been planned. With practically all the foreign observers concentrated in the capital, this was the point where a show of strength would make the deepest impression.

Both the official returns announced by the P. R. M. and Almazán's claim of 90 per cent of the total vote must be taken with liberal pinches of salt. The electoral machinery and measures for safeguarding the sanctity of the ballot are so deficient that no reliable count is possible. From the very beginning of this campaign, however, only two questions have had any significance. The first was whether the Mexican reactionaries would succeed in reversing the whole current of the Mexican Revolution and in restoring the happy pre-Cárdenas days of the Calles dictatorship; the second was whether Almazán would accept his defeat or would seek to revise the election by an appeal to arms. For a brief moment on Election Day it looked as though the Almazanistas might really go through with their show. Four tense days followed, but when the counting boards met on July 11 and the government announced its intention of protecting them from any attempt at violence, the Almazán "revolution" faded away. Since then the P. R. U. N. (Almazán's party) has abandoned its threat of a dual congress and is submitting its "case" to the Supreme Court. Almazán himself has gone on a vacation to Cuba, Yucatan, and points south. Even the pro-Almazán press is tapering off its propaganda.

There is still, of course, a certain amount of horse-trading to be done. In five electoral districts of the capital "irregularities" in the voting were discovered. The P. R. M. is claiming these districts along with the other seven, but the way has clearly been left open for a deal with the disappointed losers. Almazán can't be President, but perhaps he can have five seats in the Chamber of Deputies—if he and his followers behave. It rests with the new Congress, which meets as an electoral college next month, to pass on the validity of its own and the presidential election. The Congress can reject the P. R. M. credentials for the doubtful seats and either give them to the Almazán candidates or invalidate the election. The P. R. U. N. says it will not thus be bribed, but it is even money in Mexico City that it will eventually take the seats—if it can get them, which is by no means certain.

Has all this anything to do with democracy? I believe it has a great deal to do with it. It is folly to judge Mexico by standards proper to other countries. The Mexican people are still largely illiterate and only just emerging from centuries of unexampled exploitation. Sooner or later Mexico will doubtless replace its present visionary election law with legislation better adapted to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country's real conditions. The crux of the matter, however, is not the law or the changes that may be made in it. What needs to be developed is the content of democracy, not its formalisms. If progressives have sympathized with the Cárdenas government it is because the President was promoting democratic controls of the nation's economic life and giving the Mexican masses renewed hope in their future and a new dignity as human beings. This is the essence of the social movement known as the Mexican Revolution, which may be briefly defined as an effort to reinforce theoretical democracy with economic reality. It was no accident that the Mexican reaction chose Almazán as standard-bearer in its latest assault on the revolutionary movement. He had already served with Huerta in the early attempt to kill the revolution almost at birth. Under him Mexico would have set the clock back a generation; under Avila Camacho the Mexican people may have an opportunity to continue their struggle to bring a genuine Mexican democracy into being.

Within the Gates

THIS instalment of Within the Gates is devoted to a brief summary of existing pro-fascist organizations in the United States. It makes no pretense to completeness; its purpose is to serve only as a frame of reference for material to appear in later issues on the activities of the groups and individuals mentioned. Hiding behind meaningless names and protesting too much their devotion to the Constitution, leaders of more than 800 organizations are actively working for the destruction of democracy in the United States. Blindly subservient to their leaders, sometimes unaware of the implications of the program they follow, a considerable army of Americans and aliens in this country are affiliated or sympathetic with these organizations. Fascism's fifth column is marching down Main Street.

It is difficult to fit fascist organizations into categories, although, at the risk of oversimplification, it can be done in a general way. They can, for example, be classified according to nationality—foreign, hyphenated, and native American. In the first of these categories, foreign fascists, are only two groups, German and Italians, but both have well-integrated, lavishly financed propaganda machines. Directly responsible to the Berlin and Rome foreign offices, they form a vast network which operates in the United States primarily through the diplomatic and consular staffs. Typical of these official agents is the Italian consul general in New York, Gaetano Vecchiotti, who, in addition to supervising the distribution of fascist propaganda, has addressed several mass-meetings of uniformed Italian-American Black Shirts. The propaganda work of the embassies and consulates has been aided during the past year by the German Library of Information, and for the past three years by the Italian Library of Information, both in New York.

Cooperating with consuls and diplomats, and under the direct supervision of their respective ambassadors in Washington, are the secret agents of the German Gestapo and the Italian Ovra, whose job is to terrorize Americans of German and Italian descent and stamp out anti-fascist activity among them. They operate in the shadow, and their identity and number are not easy to ascertain.

The hyphenated organizations working under the direct supervision of the German and Italian governments are well known but not very important, for the average American instinctively resents products with a foreign label. The best-known German groups are the German-American Bund, the German-American Business League, the German Edda Culture League, the American National Labor Party, and the German Commonwealth for Art and Literature. The last, in spite of its innocent-sounding name, has a storm-troop division and a political unit.

Perhaps the most influential of the Italian-American groups is the Lictor Federation, which swallowed most of the 129 *fascios* of the now defunct Fascist League of America. Other important Italian propaganda agencies are the Dante Alighieri Society, the American-Italian Union, the Italian Historical Society, the Sons of Italy, and the International Confederation of America.

Far more dangerous and numerous than either the foreign or the hyphenated organizations are the native American fascist groups. Their menace lies in the fact that they have endowed an alien idea with a distinctly American flavor. The American fascist leaders can be subdivided—again risking oversimplification—into three groups according to the particular activity they stress—the propagandists, the organizers of "shirted" troops, and the politicians.

One of the chief American fascist propagandists is Robert Edward Edmondson, head of Edmondson's Economic Service, who from his headquarters in the Pocono Mountains of Pennsylvania floods the nation with hundreds of thousands of "Vigilante Bulletins," which proselyte for a native version of fascism. Similar activities are being carried on by James True in Washington, D. C., W. J. Cameron (Henry Ford's radio voice) in Detroit and Chicago, Charles Phillips in Lincoln, Nebraska, Charles Hudson in Omaha, William Kullgren in Atascadero, California, Henry Gaede (alias Henry G. Curtiss) in New York, and perhaps fifty others.

The best known of the storm-troop organizers is William Dudley Pelley, of Asheville, North Carolina, whose uniformed Silver Shirts are to be found in nearly every section of the country. Emulating the methods and objectives of Hitler's Brown Shirts and Mussolini's Black Shirts, these hoodlums prefer, and practice, violence as a means of establishing the totalitarian state. Pelley, of course, also operates a large and highly efficient printing plant grinding out tons of fascist propaganda, which is distributed by numerous other groups besides his own. Lesser Führers are George Christians of the Crusader White Shirts in Tennessee, John Henry Peyton of the American Rangers in California, William Gregg Blanchard III of the White Front in Florida, and a host of smaller fry.

Only during the past year or two have certain of our legislators indicated unmistakable fascist tendencies. One of the most influential is Senator Robert Rice Reynolds of North

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Carolina, who early in 1939 formed the American Vindicators, an anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, anti-alien organization marked with all the stigmata of fascism. Closely associated with Senator Reynolds are George Deatherage of St. Albans, West Virginia, leader of the American Nationalist Confederation, and James True of Washington, D. C. Even more openly fascist than Senator Reynolds is Representative Jacob Thorkelson of Montana, whose reputation as the most prolific extender-of-remarks in Congress was the result of his regular insertion in the *Congressional Record* of such pieces of Nazi propaganda as "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion." The 1940 primaries have added some new names to the list of politically ambitious fascist leaders: Joseph E. McWilliams and James Stewart in New York, Kenneth Brown in Oregon, Father Coughlin's aide, Louis B. Ward, in Michigan, and a dozen others in various sections of the country.

American fascist groups can be further subdivided with respect to their membership appeal. A large group of ministers—notably Gerald B. Winrod of the Defender Movement in Kansas, Harry H. Hodge of the Christian Americans in Beaumont, Martin Luther Thomas of the Christian American Crusade in Los Angeles, Gerald L. K. Smith of the Committee of One Million in Detroit, W. B. Riley in Minneapolis, and George Griffith in Kansas City—appeal primarily to the religious fundamentalists, who believe that "Jewish communism" is the anti-Christ and that Hitler is its great enemy. At least 15,000,000 Americans are under the influence of this type of leader.

Then there are such organizations as Edward Hunter's Industrial Defense Association in Boston and Harry Jung's American Vigilant Intelligence Federation in Chicago, which have combined spying and strike-breaking with the peddling of "inside information" to naive industrialists.

Another large group exploited by fascist leaders is formed by Catholics, who have been influenced by such spokesmen as Father Coughlin, Father Brophy, Father Curran, and several hundred less well-known priests who would welcome a form of clerical fascism in the United States—as they did in Spain. Under this influence many Catholics join organizations like Joseph McWilliams's Christian Mobilizers or John Cassidy's Christian Front, which has units as far inland as St. Louis. In all fairness it should be said that many members of these organizations believe they are defending the faith and have no idea that they are supporting a movement to destroy democratic government.

Even those rugged individualists the farmers have not escaped the fascist web. A large percentage of landowners on the West Coast from Washington to Southern California have been drawn, either voluntarily or against their will, into the Associated Farmers, Inc., and affiliated organizations. Employing both the brute force of vigilante groups and anti-Semitic propaganda, these organizations seek to break up labor unions, particularly among rural migratory workers. Their goal is an American version of the Nazi Labor Front.

In brief, fascism in the United States is a sprawling but interrelated network, originating both within the nation and abroad, employing all the familiar devices of terror and violence and propaganda, and making a separate appeal to every stratum in our socio-politico-religious structure. Its recent progress has been impressive.

In the Wind

FEAR IS GROWING in New Deal circles that labor may take a trimming in the defense industries. In the aluminum dispute government conciliators sided with the union (quietly), but the company sat tight. Finally the conciliators yielded, then persuaded the union to do so. The same situation is developing in other industries throughout the country. Both labor and government are fearful of strikes, and industry knows it.

THE FIGHT between Martin Dies and his liberal opponents may break out again soon. It is reported that Dies supporters are preparing a new blast against Washington liberals who joined in the attack on Dies last winter. The outburst may be linked to the Dies "investigation" of the National Maritime Union.

PM POSTSCRIPT: An East Side fish peddler one day found a competitor on the same block. The competitor's fish were the same, but his prices were higher. A lot of people, nevertheless, took his wares and paid the higher price. Finally the first peddler asked his rival how he got away with it. "I wrap my fish in *PM*," he explained.

PENNSYLVANIA'S LATEST mine disaster got a good deal of publicity, and the Neely bill for additional safety measures in mines was passed in the Senate. It is now lying around waiting for House action, while mine owners are fighting vigorously for its burial.

WALTER WINCHELL was pretty stunned by the *New Yorker's* "profile" (six weeks long). He told intimates he had expected a blurb. The series started that way, got sharper as it went along, finally became an indictment of Winchell's accuracy.

CURRENT ATTACKS on liberal textbooks have now crystallized into a committee. It is called "Guardians of Education" and is officially led by Major Edward Rudd, a close associate of Merwin K. Hart.

A SHOWDOWN between the Administration and reactionary industrialists may occur in connection with the United Automobile Workers' drive to organize Ford. The drive is quietly getting under way and will gain momentum soon. Ford shows no sign of retreating.

McKEESPORT, PENNSYLVANIA, recently introduced an ordinance requiring aliens to be fingerprinted. United States officials asked that the matter be left to federal supervision, but McKeesport's mayor refused. After a certain deadline aliens who refused to comply were to be arrested. On the day set for the arrests lightning hit the City Hall. The arrests were postponed.

[*We invite our readers to submit material for In the Wind —either clippings with source and date or stories that can be clearly authenticated. A prize of $5 will be awarded each month for the best item.*—EDITORS THE NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS and the ARTS

Notes by the Way

LEO HUBERMAN'S new book, "America, Incorporated," (Viking Press, $2.75) is an economic history of America from 1865 to the present designed for the man in the street; it is well organized, simply written, and moves at a fast pace. In his first eighty-eight pages Mr. Huberman traces swiftly the meteoric rise of American capitalism on the wings of incorporation and its inevitable flight into imperialism; he records the futile attempts of labor and the farmers and William J. Bryan to curb the predatory bird—and the consistency and success with which the courts, especially the Supreme Court, defeated all such attempts. This unequal struggle reached its ironic climax when the Sherman Anti-Trust Act was turned into one of industry's principal weapons against trade unions.

But the bird, meanwhile, was getting overweight; both at home and abroad the possibility of the long flight, calculated to work off surplus, grew ever slighter as the economic universe contracted and free enterprise congealed into monopoly. The first World War and the speculative boom that ended in 1929 proved to be only illusory respites; it was a very blue eagle that sat before the White House door when Franklin D. Roosevelt took over in March, 1933.

The second and longer part of the book is story, analysis, and estimate of the New Deal. It was, says Mr. Huberman, a revolution in ideas but not in economics: the idea of government intervention to help business, the idea of legalizing labor's right to organize and bargain collectively, the idea of protecting investors and depositors, the idea of security for old age and the unemployed, the idea that no one should be permitted to starve and that the jobless should be given useful, wealth-creating work. Many of these ideas had prevailed in Europe for decades, but they were new for America and they were important.

Mr. Huberman gives a systematic, lively, and fair account of the record of the New Deal in terms of its own objectives: relief, recovery, reform. He devotes a separate chapter to the rise of industrial labor organization, one of the two great by-products of the revolution in ideas—the other was an unprecedented increase in the political awareness, if not the clarification, of the mass mind of America. In another chapter he reviews the foreign policy of the New Deal which came into power shortly after Hitler seized control of Germany. "The outstanding characteristic of New Deal foreign policy was its comparative ineffectiveness," and this ineffectiveness "arose not from the subjective motivations at work within the Administration but from the objective interests of American imperialism in the contradictory and shifting alignments of the world powers."

Mr. Huberman's conclusions, like his analysis, are Marxian. "Monopoly capitalism in decline has tried to survive, in the last decade, in one of two ways. Either it has been put on a war footing or it has been kept going by government expenditures on public works, relief, aid to agriculture, etc." Germany, Italy, and Japan adopted the first method; the New Deal, to which he consistently refers in the past tense, was an example of the second. It was bound to fail because "the disease from which America is suffering is capitalism" itself, and "there is only one cure for that disease. The bankrupt old firm of America, Incorporated, organized by and for the few monopolists, must be reorganized by the American people for the benefit of all the 130,000,000 stockholders." With this vague imperative Mr. Huberman closes his book.

Last chapters are hard to compose these days. The traditional pattern even for left-wing writers in a country committed to optimism has been to shoot specific holes in the American scene up to the final moment of play and then end on a vague note of hope. The shooting was always more convincing than the hope; that is even more true today. The American imperialists, says Mr. Huberman merely, must not succeed in either their foreign or domestic aims. "The American people must not let them."

Last paragraphs are as hard to write as last chapters. One thing is certain: whether or not the New Deal's "revolution in ideas" is a thing of the past, another deal is upon us. Its name is defense. Orthodox Marxist logic dictates the assumption that we are now headed irrevocably through defense dictatorship to fascism; therefore Mr. Huberman believes that the party of the New Deal offers nothing the Republicans are not willing to grant, with the reservation that our plunge into darkness might be slower under a Democratic Administration. But in this age of the lesser evil the chance that our rights will survive longer under a Roosevelt than under a Willkie, that a Roosevelt would be less likely to make a deal with a victorious Hitler, are straws worth clutching. It seems too clear for comfort that socialism—unless one chooses to call Russian totalitarianism by that name—lies not just around the corner of the imperialist war but at the end of a long period of preparation better carried on with civil rights than without. At this point, whatever the verdict of good Marxist logic, good politics dictates a determined fight to use the forces set in motion by the "revolution in ideas" to preserve those rights as long as possible. Good Marxist logic has been upset before. Is that a note of hope?

AS A RELIEF from all this I picked up a book about cattle brands called "Hot Irons," by Oren Arnold and John P. Hale (Macmillan, $2.50), which transported me for two hours to that astounding West of ours. The first chapter begins by assuming that "you have a cow." It goes on to assume that you can ride a horse, have just purchased a huge ranch in Arizona, and are looking it over. These are pleasant assumptions. Messrs. Arnold and Hale know their ranch life. They also know a great deal about cattle brands and the stories behind them. And they bring the ranch and the range to life so vividly—the sound of bawling steers, the smell of burning hair, and the sight of unfenced spaces—as to arouse nostalgia

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in one who once owned a cow. My brand is not set down in "Hot Irons," but hundreds are, and in recording them the authors have covered much of the history as well as the heraldry of the Western range.

MARGARET MARSHALL

Miss Stein and France

PARIS FRANCE. By Gertrude Stein. Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

THIS book might be called "The Autobiography of Paris, France," since, like the other autobiographies by Gertrude Stein, it tells less about its subject than about its author. That smart-Aleck remark may not be altogether fair, for as we read about Miss Stein—her dogs, her friends, the village of Bilignin, and the town of Belley near her country home—we also learn much about the French and even something about Paris. In an appallingly and delightfully confused manner which simulates a one-sided conversation Gertrude Stein does discuss fashions, cooking, latinity, the French family, the peasant, and such very French concepts as civilization and equality. As if talking on the lawn at Bilignin, she illustrates her points with amusing or pathetic anecdotes—sometimes lost on the reader because he does not belong to her coterie—and peppers her speech with quaint expressions translated literally from the French. The book is full of charm, a very personal charm, and humor. Its 120 pages overflow with sententious remarks, such as "The reason why all of us naturally began to live in France is because France has scientific methods, machines, and electricity, but does not really believe that these things have anything to do with the real business of living. Life is tradition and human nature"; or "All Frenchmen know that you have to become civilized between eighteen and twenty-three and that civilization comes upon you by contact with an older woman, by revolution, by army discipline, by any escape or by any subjection, and then you are civilized and life goes on normally in a Latin way, life is then peaceful and exciting, life is then civilized, logical and fashionable in short life is life." The trouble with the post-war generation, she says, is that war prevents the process of civilization and that the young men "missed their time for becoming civilized." But this had already been said by any number of those very young men and before them by another lost generation, that of Alfred de Musset.

To Gertrude Stein, as to many of us, Paris has meant civilization. Moreover, as she says so neatly, "Paris was where the twentieth century was." Firmly rooted in tradition, the French have been able to accept and try everything without losing their balance. Their keen sense of reality is so great that they can tolerate any degree of unreality. Yet with these qualities that she recognizes in them, and their logic and supreme degree of civilization, Miss Stein does not grant them any role, except that of "inevitable background," in the creation of twentieth-century art. In other words, the French looked on as picturesque and indulgent bystanders while the Picassos, the Steins, the Sir Francis Roses, the Bromfields, and the Hemingways made modern art. This is a parochial point of view, the point of view of the Sixth Arrondissement. Yes, it is the point of view of the tourist. On considering all that Gertrude Stein's art owes to her immediate French predecessors, one cannot but find this attitude particularly ungracious.

With all its charm and flavor and superficiality, "Paris France" is a pathetic little book. It is pathetic because, obviously designed as propaganda of the nicer sort, it fails to achieve its end. The larger public having been frightened away by the author's reputation and style, it will be read and enjoyed only by the initiates, the small minority who know both Miss Stein and France. And in view of Gertrude Stein's patronizing attitude toward her subject, this will be no loss. Written before the French capitulation, "Paris France" reflects the anguish that all civilized people felt during the spring. Like all of us, Miss Stein was worried about the possible loss of one of the most precious things in the world—an irreplaceable culture. It is unfortunate that to her that culture was important chiefly as the ideal atmosphere for the creation of expatriate art.

JUSTIN O'BRIEN

Wendell Willkie's Economics?

CAPITALISM THE CREATOR. By Carl Snyder. The Macmillan Company. $3.75.

THIS book, according to the New York *Herald Tribune*, has been praised by Wendell Willkie as the "most stimulating and provocative treatment of our economic situation that I have seen." Mr. Willkie would like to see a popular edition "so that everyone could read it." I wonder if Mr. Willkie is fully aware what he is praising?

Mr. Snyder blames our tragic ten-year depression on wrong government policies and the failure to "control the expansion and contraction of bank credit"—as if that were independent of the underlying movement of production and consumption, of profits, purchasing power, and investment. The problem of unemployment, of 10,000,000 people who want and need work, he dismisses with the old argument that "technological unemployment is a phantom because technology creates more jobs than it destroys"—as if what was true in the past were necessarily true now, and as if it were not recognized that "more jobs are created than destroyed" only when the rate of economic expansion, in old and new industries, is greater than the rate of increasing technological efficiency, a condition that does not exist today. Mr. Snyder throws no light on the agricultural crisis that has afflicted the farmers since 1920; instead he pours scorn upon "sympathy for the 'hard lot' of the farmer." He insists that with "energy, business ability, and good judgment farming can be made to pay," the proof being one farmer of Mr. Snyder's acquaintance who increased yields and made money. Agricultural yields generally have steadily risen during the past thirty years; moreover, what will happen to the farmers if they all increase yields while surpluses mount, foreign markets shrink, and domestic demand remains stationary? Nor is there a word in Mr. Snyder's book about farmers displaced from the land by mechanization, or about the agricultural population surplus, now 200,000 yearly—potential workers whom the farms cannot use and for whom industry has no jobs. "Wages must be revised downward" to bring prosperity,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

argues Mr. Snyder; he forgets that in the 1921-22 depression there was recovery and an upsurge of prosperity with substantially higher real wages, and he says nothing about downward revision of monopoly prices, capital claims, and profits. Are these the "stimulating" ideas that Mr. Willkie praises?

Mr. Snyder is a statistician who trumpets his faith in an economic "science" based on "objective" statistical measurement. But his "science" moves within the institutions and interests of big business; it is an apology for big business. The "science" throws hardly any light on the economic problems that press upon our generation and offers no elements for a government policy except those that would make the problems worse.

Capitalism is for Mr. Snyder an absolute that always was and always will be; he ignores the meaning of changes in the capitalist system. Thus he calls upon Adam Smith for support without realizing that the monopoly capitalism of today is different from the competitive capitalism of Smith, who damned monopoly and envisioned a flexible economic world of multitudes of small independent producers; that world has changed in the United States, too, for today only 15 out of every 100 Americans own their means of making a livelihood, as compared with 80 out of 100 in the 1820's. Mr. Snyder calls the roll of capitalist economic achievements. Agreed—they have been truly great. But his "science" takes no account whatever of the economic changes that are transforming capitalism the creator into the destroyer of its own achievements. Thus, because in the past the greater the accumulation of capital the greater the production, Mr. Snyder makes an absolute of "the capital supply," regards it as the solution of all problems. The fetishism is really fantastic.

Mr. Snyder argues that there should be *more* concentration of income, not less, because the rich ("prejudice against the rich," he says, "is one of our great potential dangers") supply most new capital out of their savings; hence the income tax is a "most disastrous mistake . . . an instrument of oppression and economic terrorism." Clearly, however, "the capital supply" is not an absolute unrelated to other factors. There must be a definite ratio of new capital to production and consumption, of saving to spending, and industry must be capable of absorbing the new capital in order to create an upward-moving economic balance. That ratio is not an absolute; it changes with the growth of industry. There is proportionally more need for new capital investment in the earlier stages of capitalism than in the later. Today, because of the high level of our productive power, and because that "creation of new industries and expansion of the old" of which Mr. Snyder speaks no longer operates on the old scale, the ratio of usable new capital to production capable of yielding the profit demanded by capital is moving downward. Unusable surplus capital piles up while production and consumption stick in the swamp of depression. Smaller capital supply (and profits) and greater consumer purchasing power now would yield greater increase in usable capital, because the enlargement of consumption demand would result in *full use* of *all* our economic resources and labor, whose unemployment during the past ten years has meant a loss of $250,000,000,000 in goods and services, including capital goods, that might have been produced. Yet Mr. Snyder wants to decrease consumer purchasing power by lowering wages, to let the rich get richer and pile up profits and capital—which are not, as he insists they are, "self-limiting" except in the catastrophic sense of depression—to let big business alone. Are these the "stimulating" ideas that Mr. Willkie praises?

The danger of Mr. Snyder's "objective" rationalizations is that they give a "scientific" guise to interests and ideas that now bar the road of economic progress. That is bad enough. But there is another danger. Mr. Snyder's book is full of explosive prejudices and passions. Unemployment insurance and the WPA are bad because they "diminish competition for available jobs." Unions are bad. Collective bargaining means "coercion of industry." The unions prevent recovery by maintaining "high wages." England and Germany were the first countries to approach "industrial stagnation" because they were "the most highly unionized." Inequality among races, nations, and individuals is a natural law, "part of the scheme of creation." Our troubles are due to biological deterioration of the population, the mass of which is "essentially neolithic in character and intelligence." Civilization is endangered by "the 'vast surge of the underworld' described by Ortega, the advent to power of the masses," the people whose urge is "to destroy, to abase the talented, the capable, and the rich." Are these the "stimulating" ideas that Mr. Willkie praises?

QUISISANA CAMPS
On Lake Kezar in Center Lovell, Maine
Located on LAKE KEZAR (considered most beautiful in U. S. A.) in Maine's pine woods and White Mountain Region
QUAINT • RESTFUL • ROMANTIC • CULTURED COMPANIONSHIP
Cheerful individual cottages with bath, fireplaces, electricity. Main Lodge rooms with or without private bath. Food of highest quality, wholesome, tempting. Golf, tennis, boating, swimming, natural sand beach. Excellent fishing: Salmon, Black Bass, Brook Trout. Non-sectarian. Ownership-Management.
RATES: From $35 a week per person, including meals WRITE FOR BOOKLET

You may buy
BOOKS
through The Nation

At the request of many readers who reside in communities in which no bookshop has been established, *The Nation* offers to deliver any book to your door at the regular publisher's price (postfree) provided payment is received with the order or publisher's price plus postage if sent C. O. D.

Please address your orders to
THE READERS' SERVICE DIVISION
The Nation • 55 Fifth Avenue • New York

SPECIAL NOTICE TO CANADIAN SUBSCRIBERS
Because of the new Excise War Tax on American periodicals going into Canada as well as the present exchange rate, THE NATION is obliged to increase immediately the rate on Canadian subscriptions from $5.50 to $6.00.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not one of Mr. Snyder's statements is capable of objective scientific verification. Observe them carefully: they are the prejudices and passions that explode in fascism, the ingredients of the theory of the "élite" which animates its philosophy. I do not believe Mr. Snyder is a fascist. But his ideas may help to bring the storm that will overwhelm him —and Mr. Willkie too. LEWIS COREY

Portrait in Paper

ONE PART LOVE. By Babette Deutsch. Oxford University Press. $1.75.

BABETTE DEUTSCH'S poems bear about the same relation to poetry that book reviewing does to criticism. They are brisk, brittle, competent, and, above all, timely. The book reviewer, though he may handle more books than the critic, though he takes them up and puts them down with the same appearance of authority, though he may on occasion show great critical acuteness, can never forget that what he writes is going into print alongside the news of the day. He cannot forget the competition of the front page. Miss Deutsch, when she sits down to write a poem, presumably looks into her heart, to write of what she finds there. But she can never quite see what she has found. For everything comes to her through a blur of headlines. She is diverted. She is unable to concentrate either on the horrors of the outer world or on the domestic situation of the heart. She may achieve moving passages, but her poetry is not sustained. She is too distracted to concentrate on the exigencies of a poem.

But just as Picasso in his *papiers collés* period, out of fragments of the most disparate material—a bit of musical score, scraps of wallpaper from demolished houses, squares of workmen's sandpaper, old newspapers—could put together, adding paint where it was strictly necessary, a composition that was at the same time a portrait, so "One Part Love" does carry a certain conviction as a self-portrait. The fragments are here; we have only to put them together to see a woman of decent discernment, who in the midst of a friend's porcelain and fine furniture can come out fearlessly for revolution, whose feeling for the friendless goes out in a glance. The sympathy for the empty, the sick, and the cold, for all those whose courage is worn, and whose peace is gone, is genuine, but being without will it ends in a glance. She announces the coming of violence in a brave voice and solidarity with the suffering in a strong voice; but having more melancholy than rage, she knows that when doom comes it will be as dingy as decay in a street of brownstone houses, to which "Tomorrow will come, naturally, like death"; and when she stops speaking she knows she is as lonely as ever. Her distress is that of a seamstress, who would have more trust in her own skill if she had more confidence in her material. Miss Deutsch does not really trust poetry. Every effect is scattered, but that in the end produces a certain effect, which is that of a document on the depression. This is a portrait which, like the *papiers collés,* already dates; but it has a certain period value.

JOHN PEALE BISHOP

The New Order in Asia

JAPAN'S CASE EXAMINED. By Westel W. Willoughby. John Hopkins Press. $2.50.

FEW Americans have sympathized with Japan in its invasion of China. But there have been times when even the most confirmed Sinophile must have wondered whether Japan's case really was as bad as it seemed from the presentation of its own spokesmen. Professor Willoughby is the first scholar who has had the patience to subject the Japanese arguments to a detailed scrutiny. The result is an even more devastating case against the Japanese than is apparent from day-to-day developments. Close analysis reveals how the Japanese have repeatedly shifted their arguments as the falsity of their contentions has become evident. At first the invasion of Manchuria was defended as a necessary measure of self-protection. The Japanese promised to withdraw their troops as soon as the immediate threat to Japanese lives and property was removed. Then other defenses were offered. The Chinese were illegally boycotting Japanese goods; China was so disorganized that Japan had to restore law and order. Japan had vital interests which made it necessary for it to control Manchuria; the Japanese had to intervene in order to prevent communism from gaining a strangle-hold on the Asiatic mainland. In no case does Professor Willoughby find support in fact or in law for the Japanese contentions. He cites the findings of the Lytton Commission to refute Japan's earlier pretexts, and builds a strong case to show that the more recent Japanese invasion was motivated primarily by a desire to check the rapid unification and modernization by which China was greatly increasing its strength.

Professor Willoughby also tackles Japan's claim that its policies in East Asia rest on a doctrine similar to the American Monroe Doctrine. This so-called Japanese Monroe Doctrine clearly implies more than the resolve to prevent Western domination of China. It seems to imply complete economic and political control of the Asiatic mainland, and rejects Chinese sovereign rights in so far as they conflict with Japanese ambitions. Thus it bears little resemblance to the American Monroe Doctrine, whereby the United States undertakes to aid in preserving the independence and territorial integrity of the American republics. MAXWELL S. STEWART

CONTRIBUTORS

MAX LERNER, a former editor of *The Nation,* is professor of political science at Williams College. He is the author of "It Is Later Than You Think" and "Ideas Are Weapons."

HARRY BLOCK is *The Nation's* Mexican correspondent.

JUSTIN O'BRIEN, author of "The Novel of Adolescence in France," is assistant professor of French at Columbia University.

LEWIS COREY is the author of "The Decline of American Capitalism" and "The Crisis of the Middle Class."

JOHN PEALE BISHOP is the author of "Now with His Love" and "Minute Particulars."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECORDS

THE machine on which I play records nowadays gives the finest reproduction I have heard thus far. The core of it is the amplifier of a recently bought two-year-old Scott thirty-tube Philharmonic radio; in the same low cabinet, feeding into the amplifier, is an Audak D-36 phonograph pickup which is mounted with the Garrard motor on a motor-board that rises about a half-inch above the sides of the cabinet, so that both are easily accessible to a seated person; and from the amplifier a cable goes to the fifteen-inch Scott speaker, which is in a specially constructed cabinet in a far corner. This speaker cabinet is a box made of three-quarter-inch plywood, constructed and braced for complete rigidity; the interior measurements are three feet wide by four feet high by one and one-half feet deep; and the removable back fits in flush with the sides, top, and bottom. The necessary thirteen-and-three-fourths-inch hole is cut out of the front a little above center for the speaker, which is mounted with screws firmly to prevent vibration; a piece three by fifteen inches is cut out of the bottom, and the cable from the amplifier goes through this opening. The interior is lined with two pieces of Kimsul acoustical wadding, wedge embossed, one inch thick, density two and one-half pounds, made by the Kimberley Clark Company, 122 East Forty-second Street: one piece covers the entire front interior, with a hole for the back of the speaker; the other piece covers all the back except a one-inch border to permit the back to fit in flush with the sides; and the front piece overlaps the back piece. For easy handling both cabinets are on ball-bearing castors.

For the superb reproduction I get the pickup and speaker cabinet are essential; and don't let the Scott salesman tell you otherwise. If you insist on having the entire machine in one cabinet you will do best to get a Scott cabinet, which is designed for the Scott machine and excellently made; and in that case, for proper baffle area for the speaker, let it be nothing smaller than the Georgian, and the larger the better. But you ought not to insist after I tell you that one *Nation* reader who was impressed by the sound of the machine in the Georgian was overwhelmed by the superiority of the sound when the speaker was put into the separate cabinet I have described. This reader had the same experience when he tried the Audak D-36 in place of the Garrard pickup that Scott sells (that is sufficient answer to the contention that this is a Garrard especially made for Scott); and if you insist on a record-changer you should get the Garrard equipped with the Audak pickup head. With this *Nation* reader's experience and my own you need not share the Scott salesman's worry about loss of volume or of fidelity or any other inadequacy of performance through the phonograph equipment and separate speaker cabinet I recommend. The only guaranty you need—and it is one that you are entitled to—is against defective performance due to defective parts or workmanship in what Scott contributes to the setup—the radio tuner, amplifier, and speaker.

It is by no means necessarily true that if there were any phonograph equipment or setup better than its own, Scott would itself adopt them. Things don't happen that way in the world of phonographs and records: superior recording processes are being withheld from commercial exploitation right now and may not be released for decades, because of the financial investment in the present process. What Scott can say for itself—and it could be said also by the mass-production companies in defense of the defective instruments they grind out—is that there is no point in adopting equipment and setup to achieve superior reproduction when most buyers do not allow the machine to give as good reproduction as it can give even with the Garrard pickup and in one cabinet: when, for example, they turn down the treble and use non-metallic needles to eliminate needle-scratch, and in so doing eliminate the musical sounds of high vibration-frequencies that give present-day recorded sound its richness, its brilliance, its high degree of fidelity to timbre. If one wants this richness, this brilliance, this high fidelity, one must take the scratch; and after a while it becomes dissociated from the music and not even heard. But most buyers of the Scott turn down the treble and use non-metallic needles also to get "mellow" tone—that is, sound deprived of the high frequencies, the brilliance, the high fidelity. And it should be understood that the equipment and setup I have advocated are intended to produce the maximum of such brilliance and fidelity which the Scott can achieve when its treble control is turned up to the point where scratch is sharply audible, when this is balanced with sufficient bass, and when there is sufficient volume for the tone to be full and clear. The maximum is good for present-day recording of orchestra; for harsh orchestral recording, for solo instruments and voice, for some old recordings—not for all—one reduces the treble somewhat; and in operas and concertos there is the difficulty that what is good for voice or piano is not good for orchestra, and vice versa.

The Scott Philharmonic radio costs $379.50; my speaker cabinet cost $28; the price for a cabinet for the rest of the machine was $48; at Radio Wire Television the Audak D-36 costs $22.64, the Thordarson T-90A00 transformer $10, the Garrard A6C motor $10.88, the Garrard 201 motor $22.34, the Garrard record-changer (including motor) $52.90, the Audak D-36 head on the changer an additional $50, and cable and installation costs may come to $15 or $20. One can buy a piano for as little as $250; but a fine piano costs about $1,500. Just so, one can get enjoyable sounds from a Magnavox Concerto that lists at $68.50, and more impressive reproduction from the Lafayette BB-17 at $119.95; but for what my setup gives one has to pay what this setup costs. The Scott twenty-tube Phantom radio costs $259.50; and from what it sounded like with the Garrard pickup and all-in-one Scott cabinet I should expect it to give very fine results with the Audak pickup and separate speaker cabinet. The separate speaker cabinet will improve the sound of any machine; and for a twelve-inch speaker it need be only one foot deep, and the piece cut out of the bottom should be three by twelve inches.

Do not use a sapphire needle unless it is a permanent and integral part of a pickup designed for it; with a record-changer use chromium (but don't use a record-changer); with a single-record motor and pickup use chromium for the first playing of new records (one needle for four or five sides), and steel after that (a fresh needle for each side)—Victor half-tone or full-tone, whichever gives the better result in each case, and shadowgraphed if you can afford it.

B. H. HAGGIN

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price, 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, $1; Canadian, $1. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Dramatic Index, Index to Labor Periodicals, Public Affairs Information Service. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters to the Editors

Fascism Through Fear

Dear Sirs: It is evident that the issues of this critical hour have cut across old lines and that many of us who had supposed that we shared ideals and outlook on life in common have parted company and must go our separate ways. Thus Mr. Villard's splendid valedictory to *The Nation* was sad with the sadness of these times but quite inevitable.

Those of us who dissent strongly from *The Nation's* policy do so not because we are unaware of the dynamic force of fascism but because we see fascism in all its horrid aspects at the end of the road *The Nation* has been advocating that we follow. Fascism will never be imposed upon America by a Hitler from without, but by yielding to our fears regarding Hitler we are in danger of having it grow on us from within. That process is going on daily before our eyes.

What are the essential elements of fascism? We all know them: (1) Hysterical super-patriotism. This is now being whipped up in the United States as never before. (2) Racism. We see the beginnings of this in the drive against aliens. In some quarters it already begins to assume an anti-Semitic tinge. (3) We are menaced by radicals and fifth columnists, and there must be a drive to silence dissenters. (4) The enemy is bent on destroying our culture and way of life. We must forcibly save it. (5) We must arm to the teeth, conscript our youth into military service, devote all our energies to becoming a mighty military and naval power. (6) We must expand our power and commercial influence. In the case of Germany, Hitler looked toward the East; Mussolini looked toward Africa; we are looking toward South America.

Every element of the program of fascism is already well developed in the United States. It is based on fear. There was some excuse for Germany's fears. It had been through a devastating war, had been betrayed by the leaders of democracy at Versailles, had been starved and humiliated, and was in economic disorder. That the Germans should listen to Hitler's siren call to follow the totalitarian route to national aggrandizement is understandable. That we, to protect ourselves from fascism, should adopt it, is tragic.

The Nation admits, as does every responsible person who has not completely lost his head, that we are not in any real danger of direct attack, but indicates that we must fight because German agents are working to secure advantages in South America. Why, in the name of common sense, shouldn't they, and how can it hurt us if totalitarian Europe trades with totalitarian South America? The principal South American countries are nearer to Europe culturally and geographically than they are to us, they produce agricultural products with which we are glutted and of which Europe will stand in great need, South America already owes us vast sums which cannot be repaid; to conduct a large trade with it will mean further losses to us, and one year of war would cost us more than we could make on South American trade, under most favorable conditions, in decades. The best way to defeat the spread of fascism here is to keep down our fears and exercise a little common sense.

ROYAL WILBUR FRANCE

Canada Lake, N. Y., July 18

Pacifist Youth

Dear Sirs: Recently a young woman in the Graduate School of Columbia University said to me, "I am amazed at what I hear among the students. College students from all over the country are pacifist or isolationist. Some of the faculty seem to realize that we are a part of the world, but not the students."

This is true of a number of students in the large Midwest university with which I am acquainted. Many of the younger members of the faculty are also pacifist or isolationist. The theme song of all is the same: "This fight in Europe is no concern of ours. It's a fight among imperialists, all of the same stripe. British propaganda got the United States into the last war, and we are not going to be fooled by that bunk as you were."

Though most of these young people speak the language of the pure pacifist, they can be divided into various groups. One is the pro-Nazi group, probably very small in the student body, perhaps larger in the faculty but becoming less articulate. The disillusioned group is larger, and some of them are defeatist. Nothing is worth fighting for, they say, certainly not the so-called European democracies. It isn't our business to send them material aid. America is pretty rotten too. The trouble with many of this group is that they have had the Vision, have seen the perfect state—Russia. Even if they are now disillusioned about Russia, the contrast between the Vision and the reality in the democracies is so disheartening that they shrug their shoulders and ask why they should do anything. Recently in our university there was an effort to present to the students some talks on democracy, on some of the good things that have been accomplished in the United States. One young professor said, "Well, really, what is there to talk about? Just what can you point to?" And many agreed with him.

Tragically, all this pacifism, isolationism, pessimism, defeatism, comes at a time when the Fascist and Nazi youth find it most worth while to conquer the world.

EVELYNN T. BERDAHL

Washington, D. C., July 10

For Freedom of Conscience

Dear Sirs: At this moment, when the future, not of our nation alone but of all nations, is being decided, we the undersigned English writers ask to be heard by the writers of other countries.

It is not only life that is threatened; it is freedom of conscience. And if that is lost, as it is lost wherever the Nazi power extends, life itself is not worth a breath. We ask all those who have still the liberty to speak and to think, to consider what this means.

We ask you, in the confidence that you will judge us fairly, to support us as best you can in a struggle which is not ended yet. We do not expect defeat. We expect danger, and we are able to face it. And we pledge ourselves to remember that a lasting peace must be based on justice. We will set our faces against revenge.

STORM JAMESON, president, International P. E. N. Club, London Center; HERMON OULD, general secretary; H. G. WELLS, J. B. PRIESTLEY, HENRY W. NEVINSON, former presidents; BONAMY DOBREE, WALTER DE LA MARE, E. M. FORSTER, V. SACKVILLE-WEST, GILBERT MURRAY, HUGH WALPOLE, REBECCA WEST, vice-presidents

London, June

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED